

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This paper is being submitted in response to the Office Action mailed on October 17, 2005. At that time, claims 1-42 were pending in the application. In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 10, 11, 16, 20, 21, 27, 41, and 42 were allowable. At the same time, the Examiner rejected claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1-8, 12-15, 17-19, 22-26, 28-31, and 33-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Lastly, the Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a).

By this paper, the claims have been amended and a new drawing replacement sheet has been submitted. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

I. Rejection of Claim 32 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph

Claim 32 has been rejected by the Examiner as being indefinite under § 112, 2nd paragraph. As a result of this paper, claim 32 has been canceled. Accordingly, this rejection has been obviated.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-8, 12-15, 17-19, 22-26, 28-31, and 33-40 Under § 102(e)

Claims 1-8, 12-15, 17-19, and 22-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). As a result of this paper, these claims have been amended to include the language that “the attachment mechanism comprises a sewn seam formed of a thread having a strength selected to permit breakage of the thread in response to entry of gas into the cushion.” This language is taken from original claims 10, 16, 20 and 27, which claims the Examiner indicated were allowable in the prior Office Action. *See* Office Action, ¶ 9. Claims 10, 16, 20 and 27 have been canceled and claim 11 and 21 have been amended to depend from now allowable claims 1 and 17.

Additionally, claims 28-31 and 33-40 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). By this paper these claims have been amended to include the language directed to the use of “a sewn seam with a thread having a strength selected to permit breakage of the thread in response to

entry of gas into the cushion.” This feature is not found in any of the cited art. This language is taken from allowable claim 41, which has been canceled.

Accordingly, claims 1-8, 11-15, 17-19, 21-26, 28-31, and 33-40 now clearly contain allowable subject matter. Withdrawal of this rejection and immediate allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claim 9 Under § 103(a)

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claim 9 depends from claim 1, which claim is now clearly allowable. Accordingly, claim 9 is likewise allowable over the cited prior art. Withdrawal of this rejection and immediate allowance of this claim is respectfully requested.

IV. Drawing Objection Under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a)

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) as failing “to show that the thread (106) goes through the base (100) as well as through the adjacent portion of the flexible member (62) as described in the specification. As a result of this paper, a replacement drawing sheet for Figure 3 has been submitted to address this issue. Accordingly, withdrawal of this drawing objection is respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If there are any remaining issues preventing allowance of the pending claims that may be clarified by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned.

Appl. No. 10/712,242
Amdt. dated January 17, 2005
Reply to Office Action of October 17, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Sally J. Brown
Reg. No. 37,788
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Date: January 17, 2006

Sally J. Brown
AUTOLIV ASP, INC.
3350 Airport Road
Ogden Utah 84405
Telephone: 801/625-4934

Appl. No. 10/712,242
Amdt. dated January 17, 2005
Reply to Office Action of October 17, 2005

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 3. This sheet replaces the original sheet of Figure 3. In Figure 3, the elements requested by the Examiner are shown.